

SENATE RECORD VOTE ANALYSIS

104th Congress
1st Session

Vote No. 204

May 25, 1995, 9:32 a.m.
Page S-7408 Temp. Record

BUDGET RESOLUTION/\$1 Billion Defense Cut for Domestic Spending

SUBJECT: Senate Concurrent Budget Resolution for fiscal years 1996-2002 . . . S. Con. Res. 13. Lautenberg amendment No. 1168.

ACTION: AMENDMENT REJECTED, 31-68

SYNOPSIS: As reported, S. Con. Res. 13, the fiscal year 1996 Concurrent Budget Resolution, will reduce projected spending over 7 years to balance the budget by fiscal year (FY) 2002 without increasing taxes. Savings that will accrue from lower debt service payments (an estimated \$170 billion) will be dedicated to a reserve fund, which may be used for tax reductions after enactment of laws to ensure a balanced budget. Highlights include the following: the rate of growth in Medicare will be slowed to 7.1 percent; Medicaid's rate of growth will be slowed to 5 percent and it will be transformed into a block grant program; the Commerce Department and more than 100 other Federal programs, agencies, and commissions will be eliminated; welfare and housing programs will be reformed; agriculture, energy, and transportation subsidies will be cut; foreign aid will be cut; defense spending will be cut and then allowed to increase back to its 1995 level; and Social Security will not be altered.

The Lautenberg amendment cut reduce defense spending by \$1 billion and would increase nondefense discretionary spending by the same amount, with the stated intent of cutting "wasteful bureaucratic overhead and wasteful procurement" in the defense budget and increasing spending to combat illegal immigration.

The amendment was offered after all debate time had expired. However, some statements on amendments were added to the record or were made before the amendments were offered and before debate time had expired. Also, by unanimous consent, 1 minute of time was allowed on each amendment for explanatory statements before each vote.

Those favoring the amendment contended:

The Lautenberg amendment would cut \$1 billion in wasteful Defense Department spending and would use the savings to stem illegal immigration. The United States needs more border control agents to stop the torrent of illegal immigrants sneaking into the

(See other side)

YEAS (31)			NAYS (68)			NOT VOTING (1)	
Republicans (1 or 2%)	Democrats (30 or 67%)		Republicans (53 or 98%)	Democrats (15 or 33%)		Republicans (0)	Democrats (1)
Hatfield	Akaka	Hollings	Abraham	Hutchison	Biden		Mikulski- ²
	Baucus	Kennedy	Ashcroft	Inhofe	Bingaman		
	Boxer	Kerry	Bennett	Jeffords	Conrad		
	Bradley	Kohl	Bond	Kassebaum	Dorgan		
	Breaux	Lautenberg	Brown	Kempthorne	Exon		
	Bryan	Levin	Burns	Kyl	Glenn		
	Bumpers	Moseley-Braun	Campbell	Lott	Heflin		
	Byrd	Moynihan	Chafee	Lugar	Inouye		
	Daschle	Pell	Coats	Mack	Johnston		
	Dodd	Pryor	Cochran	McCain	Kerrey		
	Feingold	Reid	Cohen	McConnell	Leahy		
	Feinstein	Rockefeller	Coverdell	Murkowski	Lieberman		
	Ford	Sarbanes	Craig	Nickles	Murray		
	Graham	Simon	D'Amato	Packwood	Nunn		
	Harkin	Wellstone	DeWine	Pressler	Robb		
			Dole	Roth			
			Domenici	Santorum			
			Faircloth	Shelby			
			Frist	Simpson			
			Gorton	Smith			
			Gramm	Snowe			
			Grams	Specter			
			Grassley	Stevens			
			Gregg	Thomas			
			Hatch	Thompson			
			Helms	Thurmond			
				Warner			
						EXPLANATION OF ABSENCE:	
						1—Official Business	
						2—Necessarily Absent	
						3—Illness	
						4—Other	
						SYMBOLS:	
						AY—Announced Yea	
						AN—Announced Nay	
						PY—Paired Yea	
						PN—Paired Nay	

country. At a minimum, the United States should be able to agree to eliminate \$1 billion in wasteful, bureaucratic defense spending so that amount may be instead spent on border-control efforts.

Those opposing the amendment contended:

The Lautenberg amendment would cut defense spending by another \$1 billion; how that \$1 billion would then be spent is an open question. Senators may think that this amendment would cut "wasteful" defense spending to pay for border control activities, but all it would really do is cut \$1 billion from the Defense Department budget, whether wasteful spending or not, and spend that money on domestic discretionary programs. We oppose chipping away at the safety of our country in order to pay for domestic programs, and we thus oppose this amendment.